

TENNESSEE BOARD OF FUNERAL DIRECTORS AND EMBALMERS

MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING

SEPTEMBER 22, 2005

President Bob Arrington called the meeting to order at 10:02 A.M. in Conference Room 160, Davy Crockett Tower, Nashville, Tennessee.

Board members present were Bob Arrington, President, Danny Cook, Vice President, Ralph Buckner, Jr., Bob Foster, Wendy Hellum, and Stephen Murphy. Absent was Nancy Vincent.

Staff members present were Robert Gribble, Executive Director, Ernest Sykes, Jr., Legal Counsel, Bill Luna, Jimmy Kesey and Roy Bozeman, Field Representatives, Sandra Cooper and Jimmy Gossett Administrative Assistants.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Mr. Murphy to approve the minutes of the May 10, 2005 board meeting.

Seconded by Mr. Foster

Adopted by voice vote

A motion was made by Mr. Cook to approve the minutes of the June 21, 2005 board meeting.

Seconded by Mr. Foster

Adopted by voice vote

APPROVAL OF FUNERAL DIRECTOR AND/OR EMBALMER LICENSES: Upon motion, based upon the application records, the following applicants were approved for licensure.

**Sheila Davis White
Memphis, TN**

Funeral Director

**Charlton Rae McDade
Bradford, TN**

Funeral Director/Embalmer

**Robert Joseph Thomas
Savannah, TN**

Funeral Director/Embalmer

Paul Michael Hanson
Memphis, TN

Funeral Director/Embalmer
Reciprocity from Arkansas

APPROVAL OF ESTABLISHMENT LICENSES: Upon motion, based upon the application records, the following applicants were approved for licensure.

Anderson Funeral Home
Lewisburg, TN

Name Change
Ownership: Proprietorship

Dixie Funeral Home
Bolivar, TN

Change of Ownership
Ownership: Proprietorship

Gallatin Funeral Home and
Memory Gardens at Crestview
Gallatin, TN

New Establishment
Ownership: LLC

TABLED REQUEST OF ESTABLISHMENT LICENSE: A motion was made by Mr. Murphy, seconded by Mr. Buckner and adopted by voice vote to table the request for an establishment license to **Clark Funeral Service, Inc.** in Bristol until a violation issued by the inspector can be investigated further. Mr. Mitchell L. Clark stated to the Board that the establishment has not been open for business.

LEGAL REPORT:
ERNEST SYKES, JR., STAFF ATTORNEY

1. L05-FUN-RBS-2005019001

Complainant alleges several instances of unprofessional conduct in the handling of her husband's funeral services. She claims that FH told her the body would be ready for viewing at a particular chapel location either that evening or the next morning. When it was not there that morning, she was told it was at a different location, and when she arrived at that location at 1:15 p.m., she was told that her husband's body wasn't there either. Then the funeral director, evidently over the phone from a different location, insisted that the body was at the location, and after searching the whole building the family finally found his casket "in a back, out of the way storage area." Then, Complainant alleges, her husband's body was brought to the church 45 minutes late, and the FH had not touched up his make-up as requested. She also says two flower arrangements were not delivered by the FH. Finally, she claims that the FH failed to distribute or make available for guests the maps and programs which she, Complainant, had dropped off with the FH for that purpose.

After receiving its second notice, Respondent FH provided a non-responsive letter which said the matter "is being duly researched." The letter states simply that Friday evening visitations are scheduled from 6 to 8, "so usually there is not a specific setup time given." That letter, which provides no meaningful response to the allegations, was received by Board staff on July 25. No supplemental response has been received. Absent such a response or any real defense, it is clear that this FH acted unprofessionally and in so doing caused a grieving family additional distress.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$2,000 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Murphy to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Cook

Adopted by voice vote

2. L05-FUN-RBS-2005024531

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges that the preparation room was unsanitary in that there was blood on the table and the ventilation system was not working properly. The notice also alleges failure to provide the statutorily required crematory disclosures, failure to make FD's license available, failure to make embalmer's license available, failure to list reason for embalming on at least one goods and services list, and, finally, six specific price list deficiencies.

FH's response states that it has discontinued use of preparation room while that room is being renovated. However, the response does not address any of the other allegations.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$1,500 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Buckner to assess a \$2,000 civil penalty.

Seconded by Mr. Murphy

Adopted by voice vote with one (1) opposing vote by Ms. Helling

3. L05-FUN-RBS-2005025701

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges several pricing violations, among them inconsistencies between casket prices in the selection room and on the CPL, between the GPL and CPL, and between the GPL and statement of goods and services. Violations also include failure to include an effective date on the CPL or OBPL, and failure to provide in a conspicuous

place outside caskets the materials of which they are made. Also, the statement of goods and services does not contain a place to put the reason for embalming.

Despite being sent two notices of the complaint, Respondent has not responded.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$1,000 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Buckner to accept counsel's recommendation with the stipulation of a follow-up inspection by the field representative.

Seconded by Mr. Cook

Adopted by voice vote

4. L05-FUN-RBS-2005025091

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges failure to provide the statutorily required crematory disclosures, failure to include SS# on identification device for dead human body, and five specific pricing violations. Response indicates prompt corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing a \$750 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Buckner to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Murphy

Adopted by voice vote

5. L05-FUN-RBS-2005025401

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges failure to provide the statutorily required disclosures to the authorizing agents and five specific pricing violations. Also, notice alleges that a death certificate was signed by someone designated as "embalmer" when the statement of funeral goods and services does not reflect that the body was embalmed. Response indicates prompt corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing a \$750 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Buckner to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Foster

Adopted by voice vote

6. L05-FUN-RBS-2005026731

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges: FH failed to timely register as a seller of pre-need contracts; an embalmer's license was not available for inspection; the embalming room was very dirty overall, and the drainage system on the preparation table did not work properly; and there were caskets in the selection room that were not on the price list, as well as O.B. containers on display which showed different prices from the prices on the O.B.C.P.L.

FH responded by saying it has stopped selling preneeds in light of the registration requirement and fee. FH says the embalmer for whom no license was displayed was at the time of the inspection no longer a full time employee but merely a trade embalmer, and that as such it was not required to display his license. FH disputes the allegation that its embalming room is dirty, and it claims that even if it was messy, that was only because at the time of the inspection they had just moved the remains to the chapel and had not had time to clean. FH does not dispute the drainage problem, but advises that it will call a plumber. As to the pricing deficiency allegations, funeral director claims that he was home sick with the current price list on the day of inspection and that he offered to fax it to inspector, but that inspector would not wait. FH has since sent in an updated GPL.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing a \$750 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Buckner to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Murphy

Adopted by voice vote

7. L05-FUN-RBS-2005024581

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges several pricing violations, among them inconsistencies between the GPL and actual service charges, failure to include certain caskets on the premises in the GPL, and failure to include certain urns on the GPL. Response indicates prompt corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$750 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Murphy to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Cook

Adopted by voice vote

8. L05-FUN-RBS-2005024641

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges: failure to include DOB and SS # in the identification device for a dead human body; price deficiency between statement of FH goods and services and GPL for preparation of body; and failure to include alternative container on CPL. FH responded promptly to say that it has taken corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$500 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Cook to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Murphy

Adopted by voice vote

9. L05-FUN-RBS-2005025181

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges: failure to provide the statutorily required crematory disclosures; cremation of a dead body before receiving all statutorily required information; and improper GPL listing for "bathing and handling of deceased," when such functions should under certain circumstances have been separated into separate itemized fees. FH's response indicates prompt corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$500 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Murphy to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Buckner

Adopted by voice vote

10. L05-FUN-RBS-2005024681

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges that FH failed to file and retain cremation authorization forms, and that FH's license was not on file in the office. The notice further alleged several specific pricing deficiencies. FH states in response that it has taken steps to correct the problems.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$500 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Cook to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Buckner

Adopted by voice vote

11. L05-FUN-RBS-2005025301

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges: failure to provide the statutorily required crematory disclosures; failure to include DOB and SS# on the identification device for dead human bodies; failure to have apprentice license available for inspection; failure to include reason for embalming on list of goods and services; and price deficiency between GPL and CPL. FH's response indicates prompt corrective action, but this FH has a history of such violations.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$1,250 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Foster to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Murphy

Adopted by voice vote with one (1) opposing vote by Ms. Helling

12. L05-FUN-RBS-2005025161

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges pricing discrepancies between statement of goods and services and GPL, and excessive price on GPL for "cremation and immediate burial," as compared to the individual prices for those services. FH's response indicates prompt corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$500 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Murphy to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Buckner

Adopted by voice vote

13. L05-FUN-RBS-2005025431

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges the following pricing deficiencies: Direct cremation ranges on GPL need correcting; failure to include alternative containers on CPL; and that body in chapel at FH did not have proper identification. The notice also alleges failure to make available an employee's embalmer's license, and failure to affix statutorily required identification device on dead human body that was ready for visitation. (That tag was placed on the body immediately after the inspector pointed out the deficiency.) FH's response indicates prompt corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$500 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Cook to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Foster

Adopted by voice vote

14. L05-FUN-RBS-2005024781

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges: several pricing deficiencies on the GPL, CPL and OBCPL; failure to make available an employee's embalmer's license; and failure to timely register as a seller of preneeds. FH in its response states that it does not sell and has not since 2000 sold preneeds. Response otherwise indicates prompt corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing a \$750 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Ms. Hellum to assess a \$500 civil penalty.

Seconded by Mr. Murphy

Adopted by voice vote

15. L05-FUN-RBS-2005027771

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges failure to place required permanent identification device in crematory urn before cremains are placed in it, and failure to provide the statutorily required crematory disclosures. Response indicates prompt corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing a \$500 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Cook to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Buckner

Adopted by voice vote

16. L05-FUN-RBS-2005028091

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges failure to provide the statutorily required crematory disclosures, and failure to provide receipts for body that was delivered after hours. Response indicates prompt corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing a \$250 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Murphy to accept counsel's recommendation

Seconded by Mr. Buckner

Adopted by voice vote

17. L05-FUN-RBS-2005024931

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges failure to provide the statutorily required crematory disclosures and failure to note the date and time that cremains were released. Response indicates prompt corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing a \$250 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Cook to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Murphy

Adopted by voice vote

18. L05-FUN-RBS-2005025401

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges failure to make available for inspection six separate funeral directors and embalmers licenses, and failure to make available statement of goods and services. Response indicates that the paperwork had been unavailable because the establishment was in the process of changing management and converting the location to a satellite facility. Response otherwise indicates prompt corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing a \$500 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Murphy to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Buckner

Adopted by voice vote

19. L05-FUN-RBS-2005024621

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges failure to provide the statutorily required crematory disclosures, failure to include alternative container price range on CPL or OBCPL, and failure to timely register as a preneed seller. FH's response indicates prompt corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$500 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Buckner to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Cook

Adopted by voice vote

20. L05-FUN-RBS-2005013721

Tennessee Department of Health's Office of Vital Records filed complaint against Respondent funeral director for consistent and ongoing failure to administer death certificates in a timely manner. In 2003, the average time it took FH to file death certificates was 46 days after death. From October through December 2004, it took FH an average of 42.9 days to file death certificates. The Office of Vital Records noted that the average time it takes a FH to administer death certificates is 15 days. (Tennessee law, Tenn. Code Ann. § 68-3-502(a)(1), requires the death certificate to be filed within five days after death.)

After having been sent two notices, Respondent responded by saying that the delays have been caused by doctors failing to timely fill out the death certificates. Respondent wants doctors to be educated about their responsibility in this matter.

The Office of Vital Records sent an advisory letter to Respondent FH more than seven months before filing complaint, which letter included some techniques for improving efficiency. Also, this FH has a history of wrongdoing.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing a \$500 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Murphy to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Buckner

Adopted by voice vote

21. L04-FUN-RBS-2004197131

FH arranged funeral for mother of Complainant. Those arrangements called for a marker, which was paid for in installments by the decedent's children. When two months had passed without the marker being placed, this complaint was filed. Respondent advised Complainant that the company that was to have made the marker went out of business, but that it, Respondent, was going to find a different vendor and have the marker placed. The FH in its response said that a marker had initially been completed and delivered to the cemetery, but that the cemetery said it did not receive it. In any event, a new marker was eventually ordered and some time in or soon after February 2005 was placed at the grave. The Complainants appear to be satisfied.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$250 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Ms. Hellum to dismiss.

Motion failed – lack of second

A motion was made by Mr. Buckner to send a Letter of Warning.

Seconded by Mr. Cook

Adopted by voice vote with one (1) opposing vote by Ms. Hellum

22. L05-FUN-RBS-2005025101

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges failure to affix permanent identifying device to dead human body, failure to make available for inspection a funeral directors license and an embalmers license, and two pricing violations. FH states in its response that ID tag for dead human body was about to be placed at time of inspection, and therefore it denies that a violation occurred. Response otherwise indicates prompt corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$250 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Murphy to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Buckner

Adopted by voice vote

23. L05-FUN-RBS-2005025281

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges that FH failed to provide the statutorily required crematory disclosures, and that language describing a casket on the immediate burial section of the GPL does not agree with the language on the CPL. FH's response indicates that it promptly took corrective action.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing a \$250 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Cook to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Buckner

Adopted by voice vote

24. L05-FUN-RBS-2005016071

Respondent FH handled funeral of Complainant's husband. Complainant is aggrieved because she did not witness hearse driver lock the casket and because hearse driver did not provide her with key to the casket. FH later provided that key, and hearse driver provided statement saying that he had locked the casket inside the hearse so the family would not see. Also, the death certificate did not list the "Jr." in her husband's name, it listed the wrong sex for him, and the name of the cemetery was misspelled.

FH responds by saying that it is its policy to lock caskets outside view of family in order to prevent upsetting relatives. It apologizes for not communicating more effectively about locking the casket. FH also acknowledges the mistakes on the death certificate, and says it is in the process of having those errors corrected. FH says it will refund Complainant \$200 for its mistakes.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing a \$250 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Buckner to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Murphy

Adopted by voice vote with one (1) opposing vote by Ms. Hellum.

25. L05-FUN-RBS-2005026551

Complainant and his wife applied for 10 year burial policies on March 18, 1995. He dropped in unscheduled at FH in March 2005 to see what else needed to be done, believing that the policy was paid up. Funeral director did not have copies of the policies with him at that location at the time, but based on Complainant's representation that he began making payments in March 1995, Respondent said there should only be one payment left. It turns out that the policies had not been issued until April 1996, meaning the Complainant was obligated to make another year's worth of premium payments.

The evidence in our file suggests that Respondent failed to timely submit the Complainant's application, resulting in a delay of approximately one year between the application date and the date of issuance.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$1,000 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Murphy to accept counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Buckner

Adopted by voice vote

26. L05-FUN-RBS-2005026391

Complainant purchased a preneed policy from Respondent FD and paid the premium for the first month. Approximately a month later, Complainant reconsidered and asked for the policy to be cancelled. FD in his response states that the policy was in fact cancelled in accordance with Complainant's wishes, although there is no proof of that in the file. Also, Respondent paid first month of Complainant's premium, which is an impermissible inducement.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$1,000 civil penalty and requiring Respondent to submit proof that the policy has been cancelled and that the Complainant has been notified of that cancellation.

A motion was made by Mr. Buckner to accept counsel's recommendation with the stipulation that a complaint be filed with the Insurance Division of the Department of Commerce and Insurance by the staff attorney.

Seconded by Mr. Murphy

Adopted by voice vote

27. L05-FUN-RBS-2005026481

Complainant alleges that Respondent FD filled out an example preneed contract for her to review, and that he subsequently forged her signature to it, thereby fraudulently obligating her to a preneed contract without her signature or authorization. In his response, FD acknowledges that he did in fact sign Complainant's name to the contract, but says he did so at her specific request because her hand was injured and she was unable to write.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$2,000 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Buckner to accept counsel's recommendation with the stipulation that a complaint be filed with the Insurance Division of the Department of Commerce and Insurance by the staff attorney.

Seconded by Mr. Cook

Adopted by voice vote

28. L05-FUN-RBS-2005025061

This complaint is the result of an inspector's notice of violation which alleges that FH operates without licensed funeral director regularly on the premises. Allegation is that funeral director only comes when the home gets calls. FH's response claims that "[t]here is a licensed funeral director and embalmer at the location or is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Therefore, all requirements for operation

are met.” However, Response does not make it clear that there is always a licensed funeral director regularly on the premises during business hours.

Recommendation: Consent Order assessing \$500 civil penalty.

A motion was made by Mr. Murphy to accept counsel’s recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Buckner

Adopted by voice vote

29. L05-FUN-RBS-2005027671

Complainant and her husband purchased burial insurance sixty years ago with the understanding that the policies would be honored by Respondent FH. When her husband passed away this year, Complainant was informed by Respondent that it no longer honored policies, but it referred her to a FH that does. Complainant alleges, however, that Respondent FH said that the new FH would charge double the prices it would charge her for the services, and that its price for opening and closing grave at cemetery (owned by same company as Respondent FH) would be doubled as well. Upon being so informed, Complainant alleges that she surrendered policy to Respondent, at Respondent’s request, for a discount. Complainant feels she was pressured by FH to surrender the policy and that the prices charged were extravagant.

Respondent denies Complainant’s claim that it pressured her or that it told her the different FH would charge her more for funeral arrangements. FH acknowledges telling her that interment cost would be more with different FH, which it states is a fact because of its relationship with cemetery, but FH denies that such information was intended to pressure Complainant. FH points out that the policies Complainant had purchased in 1945 had in 1994 been attached to a new FH provider. Finally, FH responds by saying that Complainant received a total of \$1,500 credit for the policy, which only paid it, FH, \$420. The evidence in our possession suggests that Complainant was confused about policy benefits and other insurance matters, and that Respondent did nothing to violate the funeral laws. That said, the FH should not have compared its price against those of a competitor, since that practice is unduly designed to influence the client in its favor.

Recommendation: Letter of Warning.

A motion was made by Ms. Hellum to accept counsel’s recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Foster

Adopted by voice vote

30. Case No. L05-FUN-RBS-2005029141

Complainant believes that Respondent FH told her they were too busy to handle her husband's funeral simply because FH did not want to honor the burial policy. She claims that as a result she had to take her business elsewhere and was unable to benefit from the burial policy.

Her husband had very specific wishes about his burial, one of which was that he be buried immediately without embalming, viewing or visitation. Complainant contacted Respondent FH for the first time ever at 9:00 a.m. on the morning after her husband died, while her husband's body was still in the hospital, and asked FH to perform the funeral at 2:00 that same day. Prior to contacting Respondent FH, she had contacted the FH which originally had sold the burial policy, but that FH referred her to Respondent as the home that now honored such policy. That first FH she had contacted had already advised that it could accommodate her request for a 2:00 funeral that day. Therefore, she arranged for that FH to handle the service after being told that Respondent could not do so on such short notice.

Complainant alleges that Respondent FH lied to her about its schedule. She bases that allegation on the fact that the local newspaper did not list any obituaries being performed by Respondent FH on the date in question.

In its response, Respondent says that it advised Complainant that "we would not be able to handle a graveside service that day as we had other services and families that we were waiting on. I did not say that we were too busy." Respondent further says that it offered to accommodate her request by providing a graveside service that Monday, but that she flatly turned them down and said she was going to go ahead and have competitor FH handle the funeral that very day. Respondent says Complainant refused to agree to an arrangement conference, and that she was adamant about her time frame. Respondent insists that it already had pre-arranged commitments scheduled for that day which prevented it from complying with Complainant's request. The evidence in our possession suggests that Respondent FH behaved reasonably and acted professionally in its dealings with Complainant, who was making an unusual request which the FH simply could not accommodate in the time frame demanded.

Recommendation: Dismiss.

A motion was made by Mr. Buckner to accept counsel's recommendation.
Seconded by Mr. Murphy

Adopted by voice vote

STAFF REPORT:
ROBERT B. GRIBBLE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

1. Request from National Funeral Directors & Morticians Association, Inc.

We received a letter dated August 20, 2005, from David W. Akins, CFSP, Education Commissioner of the National Funeral Directors & Morticians Association, Inc., requesting to appear at the Board's next meeting to request reconsideration of a decision on August 16, 2005, by the Executive Director to disapprove requested credit because the event was held August 6-11, 2005, but no request for approval was made to the Board until August 11, 2005. Tennessee Code Annotated § 62-5-605(a)(1) requires submission of an application no less than sixty (60) days prior to the event.

Recommendation: The Executive Director to send a letter to Mr. Akins stating that an appropriate application must have been submitted to the Board no less than sixty (60) days prior to the planned event in order for any event to be considered for approval for continuing education credit.

Mr. David Akins of the National Funeral Directors & Morticians Association was present and addressed the Board on this matter.

After hearing from Mr. Akins and learning that the only mailing glitch seemed to be with the State of Tennessee, a motion was made by Mr. Murphy that the courses submitted by NFD&MA be approved for continuing education credit with modified hours (ten instead of thirteen hours).

Seconded by Ms. Hllum

Approved by voice vote

2. Closed Establishment

The office received a facsimile on August 23, 2005, from Darrell L. (D. J.) Brewer, Jr., the Manager of Decatur County Funeral Home in Parsons and the Chief Manager of Brewer Decatur County Funeral Home, LLC, which owns the establishment, stating that the establishment located at 2544 Tennessee Avenue North in Parsons closed effective August 23, 2005.

3. Manager Changes

There have been five establishments change managers since the last board meeting.

Name of Establishment

**Roberts & Karnes Funeral Home, LLC
Rutherford, TN**

Name of New Manager

Allen L. Leitherland

**Roberts & Karnes Funeral Home (Kenton)
Kenton, TN**

Allen L. Leitherland

**Austin & Bell Funeral Home
White House, TN**

Nelson R. Short

**Mid-South Mortuary & Removal Service
Memphis, TN**

Michael J. Hahn

**Hall Funeral Home, LLC
Celina, TN**

James Carl Buck, Jr.

A motion was made by Mr. Buckner to adjourn.

Seconded by Mr. Cook

Adopted by voice vote

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B. Gribble

Robert B. Gribble
Executive Director